

3. Priority Scheduling

The SJF algorithm is a special case of the general **priority-scheduling** algorithm. A priority is associated with each process, and the CPU is allocated to the process with the highest priority. Equal-priority processes are scheduled in FCFS order.

An SJF algorithm is simply a priority algorithm. The larger the CPU burst, the lower the priority, and vice versa.

Note that we discuss scheduling in terms of **high** priority and **low** priority. Priorities are generally indicated by some fixed range of numbers, such as 0 to 7 or 0 to 4,095. However, there is no general agreement on whether 0 is the highest or lowest priority. Some systems use low numbers to represent low priority; others use low numbers for high priority. This difference can lead to confusion. In this text, we assume that low numbers represent high priority.

As an example, consider the following set of processes, assumed to have arrived at time 0 in the order P_1, P_2, \dots, P_5 , with the length of the CPU burst given in milliseconds:

Process	Burst Time	Priority
P1	10	3
P2	1	1
P3	2	4
P4	1	5
P5	5	2

Using priority scheduling, we would schedule these processes according to the following Gantt chart:



The average waiting time is 8.2 milliseconds.

Priority scheduling can be either preemptive or nonpreemptive. When a process arrives at the ready queue, its priority is compared with the priority of the currently running process. A preemptive priority scheduling algorithm will preempt the CPU if the priority of the newly arrived process is higher than the priority of the currently running process. A nonpreemptive priority scheduling algorithm will simply put the new process at the head of the ready queue.

A major problem with priority scheduling algorithms is indefinite blocking, or starvation. A process that is ready to run but waiting for the CPU can be considered blocked. A priority scheduling algorithm can leave some low priority processes waiting indefinitely. In a heavily loaded computer system, a steady stream of higher-priority processes can prevent a low-priority process from ever getting the CPU. Generally, one of two things will happen. Either the process will eventually be run (at 2 A.M. Sunday, when the system is finally lightly loaded), or the computer system will eventually crash and lose all unfinished low-priority processes.

A solution to the problem of indefinite blockage of low-priority processes is aging. Aging involves gradually increasing the priority of processes that wait in the system for a long time. For example, if priorities range from 127 (low) to 0 (high), we could increase the priority of a waiting process by 1 every 15 minutes. Eventually, even a process with an initial priority of 127 would have the highest priority in the system and would be executed. In fact, it would take no more than 32 hours for a priority-127 process to age to a priority-0 process.

4. Round-Robin Scheduling

The round-robin (RR) scheduling algorithm is designed especially for time sharing systems. It is similar to FCFS scheduling, but preemption is added to enable the system to switch between processes. A small unit of time, called a time quantum or time slice, is defined. A time quantum is generally from 10 to 100 milliseconds in length. The ready queue is treated as a circular queue.

The CPU scheduler goes around the ready queue, allocating the CPU to each process for a time interval of up to 1 time quantum.

To implement RR scheduling, we again treat the ready queue as a FIFO queue of processes. New processes are added to the tail of the ready queue.

The CPU scheduler picks the first process from the ready queue, sets a timer to interrupt after 1 time quantum, and dispatches the process.


One of two things will then happen. The process may have a CPU burst of less than 1 time quantum. In this case, the process itself will release the CPU voluntarily. The scheduler will then proceed to the next process in the ready queue. If the CPU burst of the currently running process is longer than 1 time quantum, the timer will go off and will cause an interrupt to the operating system. A context switch will be

executed, and the process will be put at the tail of the ready queue. The CPU scheduler will then select the next process in the ready queue.

The average waiting time under the RR policy is often long. Consider the following set of processes that arrive at time 0, with the length of the CPU burst given in milliseconds:

Process	Burst Time
P1	24
P2	3
P3	3

If we use a time quantum of 4 milliseconds, then process P1 gets the first 4 milliseconds. Since it requires another 20 milliseconds, it is preempted after the first time quantum, and the CPU is given to the next process in the queue, process P2. Process P2 does not need 4 milliseconds, so it quits before its time quantum expires. The CPU is then given to the next process, process P3. Once each process has received 1 time quantum, the CPU is returned to process P1 for an additional time quantum. The resulting RR schedule is as follows:



Let's calculate the average waiting time for this schedule. P_1 waits for 6 milliseconds ($10 - 4$), P_2 waits for 4 milliseconds, and P_3 waits for 7 milliseconds. Thus, the average waiting time is $17/3 = 5.66$ milliseconds.

In the RR scheduling algorithm, no process is allocated the CPU for more than 1 time quantum in a row (unless it is the only runnable process). If a process's CPU burst exceeds 1 time quantum, that process is preempted and is put back in the ready queue. The RR scheduling algorithm is thus preemptive.




Figure 6.4 How a smaller time quantum increases context switches.

The performance of the RR algorithm depends heavily on the size of the time quantum. At one extreme, if the time quantum is extremely large, the RR policy is the same as the FCFS policy. In contrast, if the time quantum is extremely small (say, 1 millisecond), the RR approach can result in a large number of context switches. Assume, for example, that we have only one process of 10 time units. If the quantum is 12 time units, the process finishes in less than 1 time quantum, with no overhead. If the quantum is 6 time units, however, the process requires 2 quanta, resulting in a context switch. If the time quantum is 1 time unit, then nine context switches will occur, slowing the execution of the process accordingly (Figure 6.4). Thus, we want the time quantum to be large with respect to the context switch time. If the context-switch time is approximately 10 percent of the time quantum, then about 10 percent of the CPU time will be spent in context switching. In practice, most modern systems have time quanta ranging from 10 to 100 milliseconds. The time required for a context switch is typically less than 10 microseconds; thus, the context-switch time is a small fraction of the time quantum.

5. Multilevel Queue Scheduling

Another class of scheduling algorithms has been created for situations in which processes are easily classified into different groups. For example, a common division is made between foreground (interactive) processes and background (batch) processes. These two types of processes have different response-time requirements and so may have different scheduling needs. foreground processes may have priority over background processes.

A multilevel queue scheduling algorithm partitions the ready queue into several separate queues (Figure 6.6). The processes are permanently assigned to one queue, generally based on some property of the process, such as memory size, process priority, or process type. Each queue has its own scheduling algorithm. For

example, separate queues might be used for foreground and background processes. The foreground queue might be scheduled by an RR algorithm, while the background queue is scheduled by an FCFS algorithm.




Figure 6.6 Multilevel queue scheduling.

In addition, there must be scheduling among the queues, which is commonly implemented as fixed-priority preemptive scheduling. For example, the foreground queue may have absolute priority over the background queue.

Let's look at an example of a multilevel queue scheduling algorithm with five queues, listed below in order of priority:

1. System processes
2. Interactive processes
3. Interactive editing processes
4. Batch processes
5. Student processes

batch queue, for example, could run unless the queues for system processes, interactive processes, and interactive editing processes were all empty. If an interactive editing process entered the ready queue while a batch process was running, the batch process would be preempted.

Another possibility is to time-slice among the queues. Here, each queue gets a certain portion of the CPU time, which it can then schedule among its various processes. For instance, in the foreground–background queue example, the foreground queue

can be given 80 percent of the CPU time for RR scheduling among its processes, while the background queue receives 20 percent of the CPU to give to its processes on an FCFS basis.